



Office of the Attorney General  
State of Texas

DAN MORALES  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

August 7, 1998

Ms. E. Cary Grace  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Houston  
P.O. Box 1562  
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR98-1879

Dear Ms. Grace:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 117273.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for all investigative files, accident reports, or statements concerning an alleged injury which occurred at Bush Intercontinental Airport on August 11, 1997. The requestor is an attorney who represents the allegedly injured person. You claim that the requested information is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the documents at issue.

When asserting section 552.103(a), a governmental body must establish that the requested information relates to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation.<sup>1</sup> Thus, under section 552.103(a) a governmental body's burden is two-pronged. The governmental body must establish that (1) litigation is either pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the requested information relates to that litigation. *See Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.--Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990) at 4.

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is

---

<sup>1</sup>552.103(a) excepts from required public disclosure information:

- (1) relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature or settlement negotiations, to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party; and
- (2) that the attorney general or the attorney of the political subdivision has determined should be withheld from public inspection.

more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 (1986) at 4. Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>2</sup> Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 (1989) at 5 (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). After reviewing your arguments, we do not believe that you have established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). You may not withhold the requested information from this requestor. *See* V.T.C.S. art. 4495b, §§ 5.08(b), (h)(5) (release of confidential medical records to patient or authorized person); Gov’t Code § 552.023 (person has a right of access to information that relates to that person and is protected from disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests). We note, however, that some of the requested information is be confidential by law; thus, you should use caution before releasing the requested information to any other requestor. Gov’t Code § 552.352 (distribution of confidential information is a criminal offense).

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



Don Ballard  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JDB/nc

---

<sup>2</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

Ref: ID# 117273

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. J. Louis Gibbons, III  
Doucet & Speer  
725 So. Washington Street  
P.O. Drawer 4303  
Lafayette, Louisiana 70502  
(w/o enclosures)